

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/662,470

Applicant(s)

EKBERG, JAN-ERIK

Examiner

HUY C. HO

Art Unit

2617

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) HUY C. HO.

(3) _____

(2) JOSEPH REDMOND, JR..

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 31 July 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: A new drawing of bit indication was shown..

Claim(s) discussed: 46.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yes.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Claim 46 was discussed. The applicant's representative demonstrated that the cited art did not disclose or suggest an indication and confirmation of the presence of a middleware layer in a nearby device, subject to further review by the examiner.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Huy Ho/

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required